



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,856	06/21/2000	Erik Rucker	13237-2645	6692

27488 7590 05/31/2005
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/598,856

Applicant(s)

RUCKER ET AL.

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 02/23/05.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 13 and 21 are independent claims. Claims 21-28 are newly added claims. Claims 13 and 16 have been amended.
3. US Patent 6,067,551, Brown et al. has been utilized as a 35 USC 102 reference for claims 1-2, 4-8, and 13-16. Effective November 29, 1999, subject matter which was prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 via 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention "were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." Thus Examiner has utilized Moody et al., US 5,890,177 for claims 1, 3, 5, 9-10, 13, 17-18, 11-12 and 19-20. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 13-14, 16, and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al., US 6,067,551, 5/23/00 (filed 11/14/97).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

In reference to claim 1, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. Compare to **"a method for enabling simultaneous multi-user editing of an original document"**. Brown's system comprises the following:

- Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55.

Compare to **"receiving a request form a first user to open the original document"**.

- Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. Compare to **"determining whether the original document is in use by a second user"**. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65

- Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Brown teaches creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65. It is inherent in Brown's system that the duplicate copies of the master copy would be linked to the path of the original document that is used by the MCF. Compare to **"in response to a determination . . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document"**. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

- In response to a save operation, if a current edit is being made to a paragraph in the master copy, the user's local copy is updated to correlate with the latest saved version

Art Unit: 2176

of the master copy, while preserving current edits still pending. If an edit is not being made by another user, then updating the local copy with the latest saved version of the master copy. See figures 2A-2E and figure 3 and column 11, lines 15-67. Brown teaches creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65. It is inherent in Brown's system that the duplicate copies of the master copy would be linked to the path of the original document that is used by the MCF. Compare to ***"in response to a receipt of a request to save changes. . .determining whether the original document is still in use by another user; in response to a determination that the original document is not still in use by another user, merging the local copy with the original document; in response to a determination that the original document is still in use by another user. . .subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed."***

In reference to claim 2, Brown teaches a unlock/lock flag associated with a master copy to indicate whether the copy is in use or not by another user. See column 11, lines 43-50.

In reference to claim 4, Brown teaches that In response to a save operation, if a current edit is being made to a paragraph in the master copy, the user's local copy is updated to correlate with the latest saved version of the master copy, while preserving current edits still pending. Once the local copy is merged with the master copy, the edits are saved in the master copy for future use. See figures 2A-2E and figure 3 and column 11, lines 15-67.

In reference to claim 5, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. Brown's system comprises the following:

-Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55.

Compare to ***"receiving a request form a first user to open the original document"***.

-Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Brown teaches creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65. It is inherent in Brown's system that the duplicate copies of the master copy would be linked to the path of the original document that is used by the MCF. Compare to ***"in response to a determination . . . creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document in connection with the local copy"***. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

-Upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user version number is compared to that one user to the master copy version identifier number and based on that comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy of the document. If there is a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits takes place. Meanwhile, a different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-14, "Reconciliation Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See also figures 2A-2E and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19. Compare to ***"notifying the first user that the original document is no longer in use. . .merging changes. . .identified by the stored path"***.

In reference to claim 6, recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

In reference to claim 8, upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user version number is compared to that one user to the master copy version identifier number and based on that comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy of the document. If there is a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits takes place. Meanwhile, a different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-14, "Reconciliation Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See also figures 2A-2E and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19.

In reference to claim 13, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. See figure 2A for the file server. Compare to **"a file server operative to maintain an original document at a document location; a document editor operative to make changes to the original document"**. Brown teaches a unlock/lock flag associated with a master copy to indicate whether the copy is in use or not by another user. See column 11, lines 43-50. Compare to **"set a flag on the original document, the flag indicating that the original document is in use by a first user"**. If the flag is locked, then there is a specified amount of time to allow the master file to be set in unlock mode so that the user's local copy overwrites the master copy. See figures 2A-2E. Brown further teaches that a user's local copy must first be updated from the master copy before a local copy can be saved. The user's latest

saved local copy is compared to the master copy in a paragraph-by-paragraph manner to determine if any subsequent edits made to the master copy were to a specific paragraph that was edited by the user since the last save operation. Thus it identifies whether conflicts are present with respect to any of the current edits being made. If there are conflicts, a dialog box is displayed to the user interface screen that displays the conflicts that are present and requests the user to either "accept" or "reject" each of the conflicting previous edits. See column 14 "Conflict Resolution Procedure". See columns 13-14. Compare to ***"in response to determination that the flag is set. . .create a local copy of the original document and to store the document location with the local copy, so that the change to the local copy can be merged with the original document at a later time."***

In reference to claim 14, Brown teaches recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

In reference to claim 16, If the flag is locked, then there is a specified amount of time to allow the master file to be set in unlock mode so that the user's local copy overwrites the master copy. See figures 2A-2E.

In reference to claim 21, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. Compare to ***"a method for enabling simultaneous multi-user editing of an original document file without reference to a multi-user control file"***. Brown's system comprises the following:

-Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55.

Compare to ***“receiving a request form a first user to open the original document”***.

-Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. Compare to ***“determining whether the original document is in use by a second user”***. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65

-Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Compare to ***“in response to a determination . . .creating a local document file. . . and storing a path of the original document. . .”***. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

-In response to a save operation, if a current edit is being made to a paragraph in the master copy, the user's local copy is updated to correlate with the latest saved version of the master copy, while preserving current edits still pending. If an edit is not being made by another user, then updating the local copy with the latest saved version of the master copy. See figures 2A-2E and figure 3 and column 11, lines 15-67. Brown teaches creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65. It is inherent in Brown's system that the duplicate copies of the master copy would be linked to the path of the original document that is used by the MCF. Compare to ***“in response to a receipt of a request to save changes. . .determining whether the original document is still in use by another user; in response to a determination that the original document is not still in use by another user, merging the local copy with the original document; in response to a determination that the original***

document is still in use by another user, saving the local document file with the path. . .part of the local document file."

- Brown teaches that a user's local copy must first be updated from the master copy before a local copy can be saved. The user's latest saved local copy is compared to the master copy in a paragraph-by-paragraph manner to determine if any subsequent edits made to the master copy were to a specific paragraph that was edited by the user since the last save operation. Thus it identifies whether conflicts are present with respect to any of the current edits being made. If there are conflicts, a dialog box is displayed to the user interface screen that displays the conflicts that are present and requests the user to either "accept" or "reject" each of the conflicting previous edits. See column 14 "Conflict Resolution Procedure". See columns 13-14. Compare to ***"in response to a request from a user to open the saved local document file, prompting the user to merge. . .the original document file; wherein the original document file is progressively updated with merged edits. . .may be accessed by subsequent editors"***.

In reference to claim 22, Brown teaches a simultaneous multi-user editing of a document. See abstract. Brown's system comprises the following:

-Allowing a user to access a document for editing. See column 1, lines 45-55.

Compare to ***"receiving a request form a first user to open the original document"***.

-Recognizing multiple-user editing of the document. See column 2, lines 45-65 and column 18, lines 45-65. Creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. Compare to ***"in response to a***

determination . . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document". See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65.

-Upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user version number is compared to that one user to the master copy version identifier number and based on that comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy of the document. If there is a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits takes place. Meanwhile, a different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-14, "Reconciliation Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See also figures 2A-2E and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19. Compare to **"notifying the first user that the original document is no longer in use. . .merging changes. . .identified by the stored path"**.

In reference to claim 23, upon a user saving and closing the master copy, the user version number is compared to that one user to the master copy version identifier number and based on that comparison, reconciling the master copy and the local copy of the document. If there is a conflict, the reconciliation waits until the pending edits takes place. Meanwhile, a different user can access the master copy. See columns 13-14, "Reconciliation Procedure" and "Conflict Resolution Procedure", lines 43-52. See also figures 2A-2E and 3 and columns 11, lines 15-67 and 18-19.

Claims 24-28 are rejected under the same rationale used in claims 2, 3, 10, 11, and 12 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2176

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al., US 6,067,551, 5/23/00 (filed 11/14/97) in view of Pham et al., US 6,560,719 B1, 6,560,719B1, filed 5/17/00.

In reference to claims 7 and 15, Pham teaches a system in which a remote platform is enabled to duplicate each registry key change in a local platform. See abstract. Pham also teaches that a backup of a registry key from a local computer to a remote computer is kept in order to synchronize the data involved upon the occurrence of any changes. Furthermore, a duplicate copy is always stored and available should any problem occur with the local platform such as a modification. See column 2, lines 45-67. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate registry key association with a local copy in the system of Brown because it keeps the user from having to provide a manual backing-up of the registry keys everytime something is updated. See column 2, lines 1-15. Furthermore, it saves a considerable amount of time and effort to accomplish the synchronization process. See column 2.

8. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-10, 13, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al., US 5,890,177, 3/30/99 (filed 4/24/96).

In reference to claims 1 and 3, Moody teaches a method for consolidating edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to ***“receiving a request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local cop, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed”***. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the “edited copies” are stored until the other edited copies are complete as there would be no other way to maintain track of the edited copies that have not been merged yet, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their

editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody further teaches that the local copies of the documents are transmitted via the Internet or email and given to the editors. See column 4, lines 30-40. Moody further teaches that the editors can return the edited copies to the author by means of e-mail or other transmission. See column 4, lines 43-64. This email is then used in the consolidation process.

In reference to claims 5, 9, 13, and 17, Moody teaches a method for consolidating edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Moody teaches a means responsive to the identification of the second section for creating a consolidated document which simultaneously displays both edited and unedited portions of each of the first and the second sections and a means responsive to the creation of the consolidated document for determining changes between the first section and the second section; editing means controlled by user commands for selecting desired changes to be made in the first section from the determined changes and a means responsive to a user command for forming the final document which includes the unedited portions of the first section and the selected desired changes. Compare to

***“receiving a request from a first user to open the original document . .
.determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in
use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in
response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local cop, determining
whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. .
.merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the
local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge
of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed”***. While
Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the
path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the “edited copies” are
stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or
edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-
5. Moody further teaches that the local copies of the documents are transmitted via the
Internet or email and given to the editors. See column 4, lines 30-40. Moody further
teaches that the editors can return the edited copies to the author by means of e-mail or
other transmission. See column 4, lines 43-64. This email is then used in the
consolidation process.

In reference to claims 10 and 18, Moody teaches a method for consolidating
edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits
his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are
consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections.

Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to ***“receiving a request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local copy, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed”***. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the “edited copies” are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. In providing a copy of the original document via email, the user is supplying the path of the original copy. See figure 2B.

9. Claims 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moody et al., US 5,890,177, 3/30/99 (filed 4/24/96) in view of Thorne et al., US 5,958,005, 11/28/99 (filed 7/17/97).

In reference to claims 11-12 and 19-20, Moody teaches a method for consolidating edits made by multiple editors working on multiple document copies. Each editor edits his own document copy using an editing application. The editing copies are consolidated to make a final document copy by eliminating duplicate text in sections. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge. Compare to ***“receiving a request from a first user to open the original document. . .determining whether the original document is in use by a second user. . .is in use. . .creating a local copy and storing a path of the original document; in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local cop, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user. . .not still in use. . .merging the local copy with the original document. . .is still in use. . .saving the local copy with the path of the original document, such that a subsequent merge of the saved local copy and the original document can be performed”***. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the "edited copies" are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody does not teach inserting a default entry into the subject or message body field of the email note; however, Thorne does. Thorne teaches a method for communicating data text messages such as e-mail in which the fields are filled with default values so that the user can retain all the values without having to compose the message. See column 7, lines 1-15 and abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Thorne's default entry into email fields in the system of Moody since a default entry keeps the user from having to enter information into the fields. See column 7, lines 1-15 of Thorne.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 02/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant statement that a basis for rejection regarding claims 21-28 has not been presented in previous action is inaccurate. Claims were rejected on pages 9-11. The claim numbers were not listed in the grouping of claims; however, they were rejected in the previous office action and above.

Applicant argues with respect to claim 1 that Brown does not teach ***"in response to determination that the original document is not in use by another user, identifying a location for the original document using the stored path and***

merging the local copy with the original document". Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant argues neither Brown nor Moody teach storage of an original document path with a local copy of an original document and thus fails to teach every limitation of the present invention. Applicant's amendment recites, ***"storing a path of the original document in connection with the local copy"*** and ***"in response to determination that the original document is not in use by another user, identifying a location for the original document using the stored path and merging the local copy with the original document"***. Examiner notes that storing the path of the original document in connection with the local copy is different from storing the original document. Brown stores the latest master copy which is used to compare the latest save local copy. The master copy is stored with a master copy version identifier. See figure 3. Brown teaches comparing the user version with the master version and reconciling the master copy and the local copy by sorting out any conflicts. Applicant argues that Brown's invention differs from the claimed invention since he teaches employing the MCF to track information concerning local copies rather than the original document itself and does not need to store the original document location for future use in merging documents. Examiner respectfully disagrees that the claimed invention is different from Brown's teachings since Brown does teach storing the original document. Although the original document can be modified, it is not a requirement that the original document be modified unless the user chooses to save the local copy edits over the master copy

based on input from the user. See columns 19-20. In view of the comments above, the rejection in view of Brown is maintained.

Applicant argues that Moody also fails to teach storing an original document path with a local copy of an original document. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Moody does not state if the original document is still in use that a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for subsequent merge; however he does teach that "edited copies" and "original documents" are stored until other edited copies are complete. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. The local copies of the documents are transmitted to the editors. Moody teaches having an original document and edited document copies. See figure 3. See figures 4A-4C in which the save function is disclosed. The original document is compared to the edited copy and if there is a match with the paragraphs, changes are made. In consolidating the documents, the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge.

With respect to amended claims 1, 5, 13, and 21, Applicant argues that the path of the original document is not stored in connection with the local copy. Brown teaches creating a local copy of the document for editing by each user where the first copy duplicates the master copy. See column 18, lines 45-65 and column 2, lines 45-65. It is inherent in Brown's system that the duplicate copies of the master copy would be linked to the path of the original document that is used by the MCF.

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Applicant argues that Moody does not teach "in response to the receipt of a request to save changes to the local copy, determining whether the original document is still in use by another user" and "in response to a

determination that the original document is not still in use by another user, merging the local copy with the original document.” Moody teaches that the system waits until all the editors have completed their copies in order to merge the edits into an original. See figures 3, 4A-4C and columns 4-5. While Moody does not state that if the original document is still in use, a local copy with the path of the original document is saved for a subsequent merge; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the “edited copies” are stored until the other edited copies are complete, thus Moody is saving those local or edited copies until all editors have completed their editing. See figure 3 and columns 4-5. Moody further teaches that the local copies of the documents are transmitted via the Internet or email and given to the editors. See column 4, lines 30-40. Moody further teaches that the editors can return the edited copies to the author by means of e-mail or other transmission. See column 4, lines 43-64. This email is then used in the consolidation process.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the


Art Unit: 2176

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS
05/24/05


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER